

**MULTIPLE AWARD TASK ORDER CONTRACT (MATOC)
VA-261-12-RP-0589**

RFI's and Government Response through 9-7-2012

RFI#37 - Scheduling and Methodology:

2.2.4.2- The Proposal must adequately describe the capability to meet Critical Path Method (CPM) format requirements and demonstrate, **with the “Seed Project” schedule**, the ability to appropriately utilize this method of scheduling. For this area, are you specifically looking for some sort of draft schedule to be included along with an explanation of how we normally utilize CPM? **What we are looking for is your ability to demonstrate your understanding of CPM format with the schedule that you would submit for the SEED Project. We have seen instances where contractors can go to great lengths to explain their understanding, however, when it comes time to illustrate/demonstrate the practical application of the knowledge the results tell a different story.**

Also, under the Accreditation and Supporting Documentation:

2.2.3.2- Financial Resources: Offerors shall address a fiscal plan for covering phase-in, unexpected and/or emergency situations, and initial performance costs prior to recoupment in the form of progress payments. For this area, are you looking for a little blurb about how we can financially start a project without having payments for a bit? **Government cannot advise or give you proposal content. However, we want to ensure you that subs will get paid, that you will be able to purchase materials, and that you will be able to operate without relying on the first progress payment. The Financial Questionnaire (Attachment – G) does not clearly convey this information. It does not tell what other projects you have obligations for or the financial responsibility beyond construction that may impact your operating balances, etc. It only tells us your financial standing and approximate account balances.**

Is the title page included in the page limits for Volumes 1 and 2? **Title page is not included in Page limit.**

RFI#38 – Please confirm that the space below the Dental Clinic floor and the ceiling of the Pharmacy, is not used as a return air plenum, that all return air in this space is in ducted returns. **Correct, the ceiling of the pharmacy is ducted returns.**

RFI#39 – Specification 096519 Resilient Tile Flooring is not consistent with the Finish Schedule plan sheet 200-A-30-2.0. The Finish Schedule calls for Marmoleum (linoleum), which is available in tiles or sheet goods. Is it the intent to install sheet linoleum? If so, will it be required to heat weld the seams? **Yes, the intent is to have sheet linoleum installed with welded seams.**

RFI#40 - Will the winning bidder for the Dental Clinic be allowed GSA pricing for the floor materials? **Government (VA) does not take exception to Federal Schedule (GSA) pricing. However, be advised that regardless of whether it is proprietary pricing or GSA, the pricing provided in the proposal is what the VA shall require the contractor to honor. The government (VA) expects pricing competition and shall not make any representations as to the competitiveness of GSA pricing over proprietary pricing in relation to the MATOC solicitation. If clarification is needed feel free to contact me directly.**

RFI#41 – Para. 4.3 (page 66 of 125) specifies that the “(t)ype size will not be smaller than Microsoft Word Times New Roman 11 point font”; however Para. 4.4 (page 66 of 125) states that written proposals “shall be in a legible font size (11)”. Please clarify the font requirement. In other words, are Offerors required to utilize Times New Roman font or may they choose another font type as long as the font size is no less than 11 point? **Times New Roman.**

**MULTIPLE AWARD TASK ORDER CONTRACT (MATOC)
VA-261-12-RP-0589**

RFI#42 – As the response to RFI #11 indicated that “the decision has been made to expand the Technical Volume Page limits to no more than 40 pages”. Please clarify that this means that both Volume 1 – Past Performance (Para. 4.2.1/Page 66 of 125 and Para. 5.1.1/Page 68 of 125) and Volume 2 – Technical Approach (Para. 4.2.2/Page 66 and Para. 5.10/Page 70 of 125) each have a page limit of 40 pages; therefore, the respective paragraphs should be revised to reflect that. **Amendment #1 clearly indicated that only the “Technical Approach – Volume 2) page limits were expanded to 40 pages. Consideration is currently being given to further expand the page count of the Technical Volume, as well as the Past Performance volume. Amendment #2 will be issued today September 12, 2012.**

RFI#43 Regarding the length of time for construction of the seed project, is there a duration stated somewhere in the plans or specs?

SPECIFICATIONS SECTION 01 00 00

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1.1 GENERAL INTENTION

Work shall consist of two phases and completed by 270 calendar days after notice to proceed.

RFI#44 Spec section 233100-2.2-D mentions “optional duct materials” are allowed. Please clarify the optional type of materials allowed. Also, Spec section 233100-2.2-D calls for all operating room supply air duct downstream of the after-filter to be stainless steel. Please clarify which rooms are considered operating rooms. **There are no operating rooms in this project. Therefore the sentence at section 23 31 00 - 2.2 D (quoted below) of the spec shall not be required.**

Operating Room Supply Air: Duct and casing downstream of the after filter shall be stainless steel. Provide access doors or panels for duct cleaning at 6 m (20 feet) intervals and at each change in duct direction. See Optional Duct Materials.

The bottom line is stainless steel is not required on the supply ducts. Galvanized steel is the standard. Stainless steel on the supply is only required for operating rooms. The only stainless steel ducting in this project is for the fume hood exhaust.

RFI#45 – Amendment 1, Number 9 states “Government requested attachments (ie: A, B, C, E, G and H) shall not count against stated page limits.” Please confirm that responses to Attachment A – Performance Relevancy, Parts I and 2 will not be counted toward the six-page limit for Volume 1 – Past Performance, stated in paragraph 4.2.1 of the RFP. **“Government requested attachments (ie: A, B, C, E, G and H) shall not count against stated page limits.” Past Performance Relevancy Survey is Attachment A – Therefore not sure how much more confirmation you require beyond that. Past Performance Volume page limits have been expanded (Amendment#2) to no more than twenty (20) pages. A page shall be defined as a single side as viewed electronically. Pages with content on front and back will be counted as two (2) pages.**

RFI#46 – Amendment 1, Number 8 states “Attachment “E” – Surety Form, and Attachment “G” – Financial Questionnaire, shall be sent via e-mail to javier.castro@va.gov, and a copy to be included with the Technical volume at Tab#3.” Please clarify if Attachment E and Attachment G are to be submitted via e-mail separately from the rest of the volumes or if they are to be submitted via email incorporated with in the electronic submission of all volumes. **Attachment’s E & G are to be submitted by e-mail and a copy is to accompany the technical volume at the appropriate tab. All volumes submitted electronically and in hard copy shall include all attachments except for Past Performance Questionnaire “Attachment –C” since that is to be submitted directly from the references.**

**MULTIPLE AWARD TASK ORDER CONTRACT (MATOC)
VA-261-12-RP-0589**

RFI#47 – Amendment 1, number 5 states “5. The requirement to provide a list of major subcontractors for the life of the MATOC shall be removed from the solicitation and no longer required. The only reference to requiring subcontractor information shall be relegated to those offerors needing to rely on predecessor companies, subcontractors, key-personnel, etc for past performance.” Please confirm this relates to Volume 1, Tab 5 – List of Major Subcontractors to be used throughout life of MATOC. **Tab 5 shall not be required.**

RFI#48 – Amendment 1 deleted the requirement to submit a list of major subcontractors to be used throughout life of MATOC. Can we assume we do not need to complete Part 1, Number D2 or Part 2A. on Attachment A – Performance Relevancy Survey. **Part 1, D2 reads: Indicate what elements of work were performed by your major subcontractors and indicate if those same subcontractors will be used on projects awarded under this MATOC. Should you intend to use these same subcontractors, please list their company names and described their principal areas of work that they will perform.**

Accordingly, Amendment# 1 reads: The only reference to requiring subcontractor information shall be relegated to those offerors needing to rely on predecessor companies, subcontractors, key-personnel, etc for past performance.”

Therefore, if you propose to use subcontractor information to substantiate Past Performance, you will have to name them, and obtain release of information via Attachment –B – Subcontractor Information and Consent Form. The difference here is, you will not be required to utilize these same subs to perform for the life of the MATOC. Lastly, this means that yes you will still have to fill out the Past Performance Relevancy Survey accordingly, to include those areas that pertain to the usage of subcontractors for Past Performance Information.

RFI#49 – If the offeror is a stand-alone SDVOSB and is not relying on a predecessor company, subcontractor or key-personnel can we assume we do not need to include an Attachment B for any subcontractors in Volume 1, Tab 2 – Subcontractor Information Consent Form. **Correct.**

RFI#50 – Tab 5 – Quality Control states “Offerors must submit a QC plan that effectively covers methodology for identifying and preventing defects in quality of service.” Due to page limitations, the offeror cannot submit their entire QC plan. Would the government like the offeror to only address the items mentioned in the submission criteria or address the items mentioned in the submission criteria and submit our QC Plan in an appendix? **The Technical Volume shall be extended to eighty (80) pages total in order to better accommodate the QC, Safety, and Infection Control sub-factors.**

RFI#51 – Tab 6 – Safety Plan states “The Government will evaluate the offeror’s proposed safety plan.” Due to page limitations, the offeror cannot submit their entire Safety plan. Would the government like the offeror to only address the items mentioned in the submission criteria or address the items mentioned in the submission criteria and submit our Safety Plan in an appendix? **The Technical Volume shall be extended to eighty (80) pages total in order to better accommodate the QC, Safety, and Infection Control sub-factors.**

RFI#52 – Is the offeror to provide one electronic copy for each volume or one electronic copy with all three volumes included, or both?

2. SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

**MULTIPLE AWARD TASK ORDER CONTRACT (MATOC)
VA-261-12-RP-0589**

2.1 One (1) copy of all Volumes (Past Performance, Technical, and Price) shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer via e-mail on or before the due date. The e-mail address to be used for submission is:

javier.castro@va.gov

2.2 In addition, four (4) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy (CD Format) are to be sent via FedEx (or hand-delivered) – See Amendment#1 for additional submission instructions.

RFI#53 – Volume 3 – Price requires the Offeror to provide the completed bid schedule on the SF1442 under TAB 1. Please clarify if that means entering the amount in Block 17. **Total proposed price shall be entered in Block 17 of the SF 1442.** However, the RFP makes no reference as to the completion and provision of Attachment D – SEED Project Pricing Sheet. Therefore, are Offerors also to enter the amount of Bid Item #1 in the Block 17 of the SF 1442 AND provide a completed Attachment D under TAB 1? **Effective this amendment, price deducts shall not be required. Pricing Proposals shall be submitted for the full scope of work provided in the solicitation.**

RFI#54 – Please clarify if Offerors must also provide a completed REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS, specifically pages 94 thru 101 of 125; if so, please indicate where such information shall be provided (i.e. Volume 3 under a new TAB 3). Reps and Certs are required and should be provided with Tab 3 of Technical Volume. **Reps and certs (ie: CCR, ORCA) shall be provided in the Technical Proposal Volume 2 at TAB 3 –Accreditation and Supporting Documentation.**

RFI#55 – In regards to CCR and ORCA, note that the Government has now opted the use of the System for Award Management (SAM), a free web site that consolidates the capabilities of previously utilized CCR/FedReg, ORCA, and EPLS. Therefore, both CCR and ORCA are obsolete. Therefore, because of this fact, please advise that an active registration in SAM will meet this requirement. **An active registration in SAM will meet this requirement.**

RFI#56 – Per Amendment 0001, and the Q&A (RFI#11), the Technical volume page limit was extended to 40 pages (excluding certain attachments). However, it doesn't exclude resumes, the QC Plan, Safety Plan, or the Infection Control Plan. Per 2.2.5.1, the QC Plan asks for an extensive amount of detail, including sample documents (mentions at least 3 required document samples, etc.). Then, 2.2.7.1 (4) asks for a seed project specific narrative, which, in addition to the general Infection Control Plan, is well over 40 pages alone. The QC Plan is 20 pages, and the Safety Plan is of similar size. Additionally, for a MATOC, most firms have multiple personnel they will want to submit in order to demonstrate capacity and resource capabilities to provide services for multiple task orders at different locations, simultaneously. Will the government consider excluding the resumes, QC Plan, Safety Plan, and Infection Control Plan from the page count. Or, will the government consider re-writing the evaluation criteria so that offeror doesn't need to submit an entire QC Plan, Safety Plan and Infection Control Plan? **The Technical Volume shall be extended to eighty (80) pages to better accommodate the QC, Safety, and Infection Control sub-factors.**